

REMARKS/AGRUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,464 to Krishnamurthy, et al. ("Krishnamurthy") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,475 to Leong, et al. ("Leong").

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy in view of Leong. Applicants submit that claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 are not obvious in view of Krishnamurthy and Leong. In regard to the rejection of claim 39, the Examiner has stated in part that:

“Krishnamurthy et al may not explicitly show a combined HTTP and SNMP manager.... Furthermore, Leong et al do show combining the HTTP server and SNMP manager, to incorporate data concerning the network management with the browser format (column 3, lines 45-57, column 6 lines 25-40). (4/24/03, Office Action, p. 3)

Applicants respectfully disagree. In regard to the rejection of claim 39, the combination of Krishnamurthy and Leong would lack one or more features of claim 39. Claim 39 recites the feature of “a **combined** hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) **server and SNMP manager**” (Emphasis added) Leong does not disclose this feature as can be seen by the following analysis. Although Leong describes a network device 32 which is capable of communicating with a browser using the HNMP protocol, and having a web-capable agent, (Leong, col. 12, ll. 61-66) Leong does not utilize SNMP. Leong’s figures 10A and 10B show that Leong removed the SNMP network management agent and replaced it with a URL Dictionary 188, and removed the SNMP protocol capability and substituted the HNMP protocol 184. Infact, Leong states “the functional layer structure in FIG. 10B differs from that shown in FIG. 10A in that the protocol layer need not include a proxy agent or the SNMP protocol. The agent 186 is able to

communicate with a web browser utilizing any of the protocols included in the protocol layer 164.” Those protocols being HTTP and HNMP as shown in figure 10B. Thus, Leong can not and does not disclose “a combined hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager” as claimed in applicants claim 39.

Krishnamurthy does not disclose this feature either, as can be seen by the following analysis. Krishnamurthy discloses a device management system and a universal site server that can be configured from remote locations using Internet browser technology. (Krishnamurthy, title & abstract) The universal site server can operate as a gateway to connect to devices such as PBXs, UPSs, video cameras, switches, and multiplexers. (Krishnamurthy, col. 5, l. 66- col. 6, l. 21 and Fig. 2). The configuration and management of the site server and devices is performed remotely with web manager 18, a remote web browser 58, and/or SNMP manager 20. (Krishnamurthy, col. 6, ll. 22-27, and Fig. 2) Krishnamurthy’s site server is functionally illustrated in his Figure 3, which shows an SNMP agent 82, a web server 64, a fax server 78, MIB 72, and various I/O interfaces. (Krishnamurthy, col. 6, l. 28 – col. 7, l. 65) Krishnamurthy does not disclose “a combined hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager” as claimed in applicants claim 39. In fact, the only SNMP manager described by Krishnamurthy is SNMP manager 20, which sits isolated on NMC LAN 24. (Krishnamurthy, Fig. 2)

Because neither Krishnamurthy nor Leong disclose “a combined hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager” as taught by claim 39, from which claim 40 depends, applicants respectfully submit that claims 39 and 40 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Krishnamurthy in view of Leong.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 39. Claim 50 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 39, and recites “means for **combining** hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and **SNMP manager**”. (Emphasis added) Because neither Krishnamurthy nor Leong disclose this

feature as taught by applicants' claim 50 from which claims 51-53 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 39, applicants respectfully submit that claims 50-53 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Krishnamurthy in view of Leong.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 39. Claim 63 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 39, and recites "**combining** hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) **server and SNMP manager**" (Emphasis added) Because, neither Krishnamurthy nor Leong disclose this feature as taught by applicants' claim 63 from which claims 64-66 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 39, applicants respectfully submit that claims 63-66 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Krishnamurthy in view of Leong.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Sept. 22nd, 2003

Sanjeet K. Duffa
Sanjeet K. Duffa
Reg. No. 46,145

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 947-8200